

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 19 and 27. Support for the amendments is found *e.g.*, at pages 4-5 of the specification as filed. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-44 are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

By this Amendment, Applicant also amends paragraphs no. [029], [031], [034], [035], and [041] of the specification to render the terminology used in the application more consistent. Support for the amendments is found *e.g.*, in the original specification at pages 3-4. No new matter is being added.

I. Preliminary Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references listed on form PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 1, 2003. The Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate acceptance of the drawings and acknowledgement of Applicant's claim to foreign priority in the next office communication since both were omitted from the present Office Action.

II. Summary of Office Action

The Examiner rejected claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0205702 to Logan, III et al. (hereinafter "Logan") in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0246682 to Hines (hereinafter "Hines").

III. Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in view of Hines. Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection in view of the following comments. Claims 1, 19, and 27 are all independent claims.

Claims 1, 19, and 27 recite, *inter alia*, “a coordination element . . . which establishes, controls and monitors the interactions of the objects involved and the sequence of the interactions of the objects over time, and . . . detects and defines, based on an interpretation of calls, parameter queries and measurement results, which object should be addressed and actuated.” The Examiner acknowledges that Logan does not disclose this unique feature. *See* page 2-3 of the Office Action. However, the grounds of rejection state that Hines cures this deficiency. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Hines does not provide a coordination element, which establishes, controls and monitors interactions of objects and sequences of interactions and also detects and defines which object should be addressed and actuated. In Hines, “[c]omponents [directly] interact through explicit and separate coordination interfaces.” *See* [0122], lines 11-12. Messages are only transferred via message ports between the interfaces and not interpreted. “The behavior of the components is encapsulated in a set of actions” and these actions are elements of modes that are attached to the components and not to coordination interfaces or coordinators. *See* [0119], lines 10-15. “[A]ll possible behaviors must be identified and encapsulated before runtime.” *See* [0121], lines 1-3.

In other words, modes in the components, and not the coordination interfaces or the coordinators define which object should be addressed or actuated. “There is a resource-scheduling period during which each participant gets the resource exactly once, whether or not it

is needed.” *See* [0125], Lines 7-9. A component can use the resource to send a message to a corresponding component, requesting a behavior of the other component.

Consequently, the coordinator in Hines only controls the transfer of messages between the components without interpreting the contents of these messages. Specifically, it does not define which object should be addressed and actuated, based on an interpretation of calls, parameter queries and measurement results, for example. Therefore, Hines does not cure the deficiency of Logan.

Furthermore, Hines also does not provide a coordination element, which establishes, controls and monitors the sequence of the interactions of the objects over time. Specifically, in Hines, processes and messages in a space/time diagram are visualized based on data generated by observers. *See* [0401], lines 1-22. “An observer is an entity that watches the progress of an execution and records events but does not interfere with the system.” *See* [0400], lines 3-6. In other words, in Hines, since the observer does not interfere with the system, there is no controlling functionality implemented that is capable of establishing and controlling of sequences of interactions over time. Consequently, Hines does also not provide a coordination element, which establishes, controls and monitors the sequence of the interactions of the objects over time, as recited in some variation in claims 1, 19, and 27.

Thus, Hines does not cure the deficiencies of Logan. Accordingly, the combined disclosure of Logan and Hines does not disclose or suggest: “a coordination element . . . which establishes, controls and monitors the interactions of the objects involved and the sequence of the interactions of the objects over time, and . . . detects and defines, based on an interpretation of calls, parameter queries and measurement results, which object should be addressed and actuated.” as recited in some variation in claims 1, 19, and 27. Therefore, claims 1, 19, and 27

are patentable over Logan in view of Hines. Claims 2-18 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. Claims 20-26 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 19 and claims 28-44 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 27.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

/Nataliya Dvorson/
Natalya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

Date: June 8, 2007